

## REMARKS

### Status of Claims

The Office Action mailed June 19, 2008, has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11 stand rejected. New Claims 12-19 have been added.

### Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify some language in the claims, and to correct some dependencies. Applicant has also amended Claims 1, 10 and 11 as described below.

### Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tiao et al (US 6,318,863). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Regarding Claim 1, the Office Action on page 2 states that Tiao discloses a light guiding plate as element 220 in Fig. 2. However, element 220 is clearly described in the figures and specification as a taper light pipe. The taper light pipe 220 has a wide end and a narrow end. Please see Col. 3 lines 18-24. As described in the specification, and shown in Figs. 2A and 2B, this taper light pipe 220 is generally shaped as a cube. It certainly does not qualify as a light plate.

Further, Claim 1 recites that “the plate being adapted to receive light from the one or more light emitters, guide the received light therein **substantially in parallel to the light transmissive display**”. The taper light pipe 220 of Tiao does not do this. The figures and description of Tiao disclose that the taper light pipe 220 only transmits light in a path **orthogonal** to the light valve 230.

On page 3 the Office Action states “Note that herein the optical axis of the transmissive display is chosen to define the transmissive display axis, and the optical axis of the plate is chosen to define the plate axis, wherein the light transmissive axis is parallel to the plate axis.”

Applicant asserts that there is no support provided by Tiao or any other cited sources for defining an axis of a light transmissive element in this way. However, to clarify the claim recitation, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite “the plate being adapted to receive light from the one or more light emitters, guide the received light therein substantially in parallel to a plane of the light transmissive display”. Support for this subject matter may be found in the specification, *inter alia*, on page 1 lines 7-10, page 2 lines 8-11, and page 5 lines 11-12. This makes clear that the plate as recited by Claim 1 is entirely different from the taper light pipe 220 of Tiao, and functions in a different way.

Accordingly, Tiao does not disclose each and every feature of Claim 1, and this claim and all claims that depend upon it are allowable. Applicant has amended Claims 10 and 11 in a similar fashion, and asserts that these claims and all claims that depend upon them are also allowable.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiao et al (US 6,318,863), in further view of Tsutsui et al (US 2001/0030571A1). Applicant traverses this rejection. This claim depends from an allowable parent claim, and is therefore allowable.

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiao et al (US 6,318,863), in further view of Bassous et al (US 4,007,464). Applicant traverses this rejection. Claim 4 depends from an allowable parent claims, and is therefore allowable.

Regarding Claim 10, Applicant asserts that the arguments above regarding Claim 1 also apply to Claim 10. Tiao does not disclose or suggest any feature regarding the light transmissive plate, or “the light received substantially in parallel to a plane of the light transmissive display”. Further, none of the other cited references, either alone or combined, make up for this deficiency. Accordingly, Claim 10 and all claims that depend upon it are allowable.

**New Claims**

Applicant has added new dependent Claims 12-19, which depend from Claims 10 or 11 and recite subject matter similar to Claims 2-8. No new matter has been added. Applicant asserts these claims are allowable.

**Conclusion**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 18, 2008

By: /David Lowry

David D. Lowry  
Registration No. 38,538  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
28 State Street, 28<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Boston, MA 02109-1775  
Telephone: 617-720-9600  
Fax: 617-720-9601